



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|--|-------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/660,464 | 09/12/2000 | Mamoun Abu-Samaha | 10005392-1 | 6535 |
| 7590 | 05/20/2004 | | EXAMINER | |
| Hewlett-Packard Company Intellectual Property Administration P O Box 272400 Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400 | | | HU, JINSONG | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2154 | |
| | | | DATE MAILED: 05/20/2004 | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

X

| | | | |
|------------------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|
| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
| | 09/660,464 | ABU-SAMAHA, MAMOUN | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Jinsong Hu | 2154 | |

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 February 2004.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-27 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-20 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giese (US 6,621,895).

4. As per claims 1, 13-14, 16 and 19-20, Giese teaches the invention substantially as claimed including a system for providing remote electronic services [col. 1, lines 15-20], comprising an agent [10, Fig. 9], an access file [service triggers, Fig. 11; col. 5, lines 23-27 & 49-54], and a communication module [14, Fig. 9], wherein:

the agent receives a request-for-service calls in any format selected from a voice format, an internet format, an e-mail format, and a wireless format incorporating one or more control parameters including a destination node address, the agent transmits a request-for-service call to the access file each of

the received request-for-service calls [26, Fig. 5; col. 5, lines 10-22; col. 9, lines 11-18; col. 11, line 22 – col. 12, line 27; col. 16, lines 37-45; col. 23, lines 49-52];

the access file invokes at least one service module [12, Fig. 9] in response to a given request-for –service call received from the agent, the at least one service module performs a prescribed function to produce a service deliverable request in the given request-for-service call, access an instance of the communication module [col.12, lines 29-39; col. 13, lines 21-57; col. 23, lines 53-58] and passes the one or more control parameters and the service deliverable to the communication module [col. 11, line 47 – col. 12, line 3; col. 13, lines 45-46; col. 14, lines 49-51; col. 16, lines 9-27]; and

the communication module transmits the service deliverable received from the at least one service module to the destination network node specified in the given request-for-service calls in any format selected from a voice format, an internet format, an e-mail format, and a wireless format [26, Fig. 5; col. 5, lines 10-22; col. 11, line 58 – col. 12, line 3; col. 14, lines 49-65; col. 23, lines 59-61].

5. Giese does not specifically teach the agent is configured to transmit the request-for-service call in accordance with a hypertext transfer protocol. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize HTTP format in Giese's system because http is a well-known protocol in the art for generating service query over network. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Giese's system with http format based on specific design requirements.

6. As per claim 2, Giese teaches an origination agent configured to transmit a request-for-service to the agent receiving request-for-service calls [col. 5, lines 49-54].

7. As per claims 3 and 15, Giese teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1. Giese does not specifically teach the origination agent is configured to transmit the request-for-service call in accordance with a hypertext transfer protocol. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize HTTP format in Giese's system because http is a well-known protocol in the art for generating service query over network. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Giese's system with http format based on specific design requirements.

8. As per claims 4-6, Giese teaches the access file is an active server page, wherein configure to obtain one or more control parameters from the given request-for-service call and to pass the control parameters to the at least one service module, wherein the control parameters is passed to the communication module [col. 8, line 62 – col. 9, line 3; col. 11, lines 58-63].

9. As per claims 7 and 24, Giese teaches the communication module is configured to communicate with the destination network node over any one of the

following transport facilities: a voice network, the Internet, an electronic mail (email) network, and a wireless network [54, 56, 58, Fig. 13].

10. As per claim 8, Giese teaches the communication module is configured to establish a communication link with the destination network node based upon the destination node address [col. 16, lines 37-46].

11. As per claims 9-11 and 17-18, Giese teaches the communication module is configured to format the service deliverable produced by the service module in accordance with an identified node type classification for the destination network node, wherein the service module is configured to produce an available services list to be presented by the communication module to a device initiating the given request-for-service call and residing at an origination network node [col. 11, lines 32-57; col. 16, lines 47-62].

12. As per claim 12, Giese teaches a destination agent residing at the destination network node and configured to communicate with the communication module [col. 17, lines 22-25].

13. Claims 21- 23 and 25-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Giese (US 6,621,895) in view of Angwin et al. (US 6,477,576).

Art Unit: 2154

14. As per claims 21-23 and 25-27, Giese teaches the invention substantially as claimed in claim 1, Giese does not specifically teach the step of converting VoxML or WML format request-for-service call into a HTTP format request-for-service call and transmit it to access file. However, Angwin teaches the step of converting VoxML or format request-for-service call into a HTTP format request-for-service call and transmit it to access file [col. 7, lines 25-37; col. 8, lines 48-55]. It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the teaching of Giese and Angwin because doing so would bring convenience to user by providing service to the user whose device has voice-only capability or the display screen is small [Angwin, col. 7, lines 31-33]. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to modify Giese's system with Angwin's converting step to attract more users.

Conclusion

15. Applicant's arguments filed on 2/10/04 for claims 1-27 have been fully considered but they are not deemed to be persuasive.

16. In the remarks, applicant argued in substance that (1) Giese does not teach anything about the format of a given request-for-service call nor anything about the format of a service deliverable that is produced in response to the given request-for-service call; (2) Giese does not teach an origination agent for receiving request-for-service call in any format selected from a voice format, an Internet format, e-mail format and wireless format; (3) Giese does not teach

transmitting a request-for-service call to an access file in HTTP format for each of calls; (4) Giese does not teach a service module passing one or more control parameters and service deliverable to a communication module in accordance with a HTTP protocol; (5) Giese does not teach communication agent receives a service deliverable in accordance with HTTP protocol and transfer the service deliverable to the destination network node; (6) rejections for claims 2 and 15 are improper.

17. Examiner respectfully traverses applicant's remarks:

A. As to points (1) and (2), applicant fails to consider the teaching of the Giese's reference for receiving specified multimedia communication requirements, which involves in different formats based on the user's device type [26, Fig. 5; col. 10, line 50 – col. 11, line 3] and delivering the service in response to each of the corresponding call [col. 11, lines 47-57]. Thus, Giese does teach selectable format of a given request-for-service call and selectable format of a service deliverable that is produced in response to the given request-for-service call.

B. As to points (3) and (4), Giese does not specifically teach transmitting service request to access file in HTTP protocol. However, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize http format in Giese's system because HTTP is a well-known protocol in the art for generating service query over network. One of ordinary skill

in the art would have been motivated to modify Giese's system with http format based on specific design requirements.

C. As per claim (5), applicant fails to consider the teaching of the Giese's reference for receiving service request call by communication module and transmitting deliverable to the destination network node in accordance with the service request call. Giese does not specifically teach the request is in HTTP protocol, however, as discussed above that it is obvious for a ordinary skill in the art to convert the request into HTTP format based on design reason because it is a well-known protocol for generating a service query.

D. As to point (6), based on the same reason as discussed above, the rejections for claims 2 and 15 are proper.

Accordingly, Giese is a relevant prior art reference.

18. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP §706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

19. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory

Art Unit: 2154

action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

20. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (703) 306 – 5932.

21. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jinsong Hu whose telephone number is (703) 306 – 5932.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John A. Follansbee, can be reached on (703) 305-8498. The fax number for this Group 2100 is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of the application should be directed to the Group receptionist at (703) 305-3900.

Jinsong Hu

JOHN FOLLANSBEE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100

May 14, 2004